

REMARKS

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1, 6-15, 18-28, 31-36, and 39-42 are presently pending. Claims 1, 6-15, 18-22, 24-28, 31, 34-36 and 39-40 have been amended herein. Claims 37-38 have been canceled by this paper. New claims 41-42 have been added.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0004] Examiner Jeffrey R. Swearingen graciously talked with me, Colin Barnitz—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on July 9, 2008. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner’s willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0005] During the interview, I discussed the function of the claimed invention, and how the claims differed from the cited reference, Bladow et al. Without conceding to the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed clarifying amendments.

[0006] I understood the Examiner to tentatively concur with the proposed amendments to independent claims 1, 7, 10, 11, 15, 18, 24 and 31 for overcoming the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Additionally, the Examiner indicated that he would need to review the cited art more carefully and/or do another search for considering whether the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are overcome by the amendments.

[0007] Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0008] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, or if the Examiner should have any questions regarding the operation of claimed invention or the location of support in the specification for any of the claim limitations, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0009] Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments and Additions

[0010] Without conceding to the propriety of the rejections in the Office Action and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 6-15, 18-22, 24-28, 31, 34-36 and 39-40 herein. Applicant amends these claims to clarify the claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. These

amendments should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited reference.

[0011] Claims 1, 6-15, 18-22, 24-28, 31, 34-36 and 39-40 are amended to clarify the claimed invention. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 7 is found in the specification, e.g., at least at page 10, lines 1-6, page 11, lines 16-27, and page 12, lines 1-22. Support for the amendments to claim 6 are found in the specification, e.g., at least at page 12, lines 1-16 and page 13, lines 11-14. Support for the amendments to claim 8 are found in the specification, e.g., at least at page 11, line 24 through page 12, line 7. Support for the amendments to claim 9 are found in the specification, e.g., at least at page 3, line 29 through page 4, line 6. Support for the amendments to claims 10, 11, 15 and 24 are found in the specification, e.g., at least at page 11, lines 1-22. Support for the amendments to claims 12, 23 are found in the specification, e.g., at least at page 10, lines 1-6. Support for the amendments to claim 14 are found in the specification, e.g., at least at page 11, line 24, through page 12, line 9. Support for the amendments to claim 18 are found in the specification, e.g., at least at page 11, line 24, through page 12, line 9. Support for the amendments to claim 19 are found in the specification, e.g., at least at page 12, lines 10-12. Support for the amendments to claim 31 are found in the specification, e.g., at least at page 10, lines 1-6, and page 11, line 16, through page 12, line 22.

[0012] Furthermore, Applicant has added new claims 41-42 herein, which are directed towards the same invention as the previously presented claims.

These new claims are fully supported by Application and therefore do not

constitute new matter. For example, new claim 41 is supported, e.g., at least at page 12, lines 1-22 of the specification. Support for new claim 42 is found in the specification, e.g., at least at page 8, lines 27-31; page 10, lines 1-6; and page 11, line 16 through page 12, line 22.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 112, First Paragraph

[0013] Claims 1, 7, 10, 11, 15, 18, 24 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph. In particular, these claims were rejected for the use of language such as setting cookie values to “nothing”. Without conceding to the propriety of the rejection, Applicant has amended these claims so as to advance prosecution of the application. In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

Claim Rejections under § 112, Second Paragraph

[0014] Claims 37 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In light of the cancelation of these claims, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

Claim Rejections under § 102

[0015] Claims 1, 6-15, 18-28, and 31-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully assert that the cited reference does not anticipate the rejected claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0016] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following reference:

- **Bladow:** *Bladow, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,115,040 (issued August 31, 2004);

Overview of the Application

[0017] The Application relates to a technology that facilitates automatic log out of multiple affiliated domain websites following an initial authentication. Following the authentication, a list of the sites that a user visits during a session is maintained. When the user selects a logout link on any affiliated server site or the login server, the user is directed to a logout page on the login server. The login server displays a logout page that explains to the user that they are about to be logged out of each affiliated server. Under one embodiment, the logout page generates image tags for each of the affiliated servers having sites listed in the list of sites. The image tag points to a URL hosted at each affiliated server that expires any related cookies that have been stored through the user's browser, whereby the logout is carried out.

[0018] Additionally, during the interview, the Examiner requested that additional discussion be included in the Remarks regarding the use of image tags in the invention. As illustrated in FIG. 3 by the example webpage 350, one or more image tags may be included in the code of a webpage downloaded from a first location, which can cause the browser to fetch, from a separate URL specified by the image tag, an image to be rendered with the webpage when the webpage is rendered by the browser. The image tag basically points to a URL where the image is stored. As the webpage is downloaded and rendered,

the browser encounters the image tag and requests the image from the specified URL for placing the image in the rendered webpage (see, for example, Applicant's specification at page 11, line 16, through page 12, line 5; page 12, lines 10-22; and FIG. 3). Thus, the use of image tags in a logout webpage is one example of a method for implementing the invention.

Cited Reference

Bladow

Bladow describes a technology for an integrated system of user interfaces for communicating with remote services. A backplane architecture controls and manages the user interfaces by instantiating, launching, overseeing and closing the user interfaces associated with a plurality of applications residing in a remote server. Each application communicates with one another and with the backplane via messaging interfaces. The backplane provides a single uniform user authentication procedure during logon for the user interfaces and also provides session management for the duration of the user's session.

Anticipation Rejections

[0019] Applicant respectfully submits that the anticipation rejections are not valid because, for each rejected claim, no single reference discloses each and every element of that rejected claim.¹ Furthermore, the elements disclosed in the single reference are not arranged in the manner recited by each rejected claim.²

Based upon Bladow

[0020] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 6-15, 18-28, and 31-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bladow. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims, and based on the reasons given below, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Independent Claims 1 and 7

[0021] Applicant submits that Bladow does not anticipate claim 1 because Bladow does not disclose at least the following elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

...providing a first cookie to a browser being used by the user, the first cookie for maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following an authentication of the user;

¹ "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); also see MPEP §2131.

² See *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

receiving a selection of a single logout link, wherein the logout link is contained on any of the sites that the user has visited on the affiliated servers;

causing a request for data from the affiliated servers to be issued by the browser based on the list maintained with the first cookie, wherein the request further causes the affiliated servers to send to the browser cookie setting information and an image which is indicative of successful logout;

clearing second cookies from the browser by changing settings of the second cookies in accordance with the cookie setting information, wherein the second cookies include data provided to the browser by the affiliated servers that the user visits following the authentication; and

logging the user out the affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following the authentication by selection of the single logout link.

Thus, according to this aspect of Applicant's invention, a first cookie is used to maintain a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following authentication. When a logout link is selected, a request for data from the affiliated servers is issued by the browser based on the list maintained with the first cookie. The request causes the affiliated servers to send back cookie setting information and an image indicative of successful logout. The cookie setting information causes the browser to change settings of the second cookies for clearing the second cookies from the browser.

[0022] Page 3 of the Office Action indicates that this aspect of Applicant's invention is disclosed by Bladow at col. 17, lines 42-49. However, Applicant respectfully submits that this portion of Bladow merely discloses that when a

customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344. The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar server 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450. The cookiejar server 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie. After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar server 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform.

[0023] Thus, Bladow fails to disclose providing a first cookie to a browser being used by the user, the first cookie for maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following an authentication of the user, as recited in Applicant's claim 1. Bladow further fails to disclose causing a request for data from the affiliated servers to be issued by the browser based on the list maintained with the first cookie, wherein the request further causes the affiliated servers to send to the browser cookie setting information and an image which is indicative of successful logout, as also recited in Applicant's claim 1. Instead, Bladow discloses that the web server receiving the logoff request connects to the cookiejar server 1352 and requests logoff for the session.

[0024] Consequently, Bladow does not disclose all of the elements and features Applicant's claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

[0025] Independent claim 7 includes limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and is allowable under a similar rationale.

Independent Claims 10, 11, 15 and 24

[0026] Applicant submits that Bladow does not anticipate claim 10 because Bladow does not disclose at least the following elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

...receiving a request for a logout page, wherein a logout link to the logout page is contained on any site that the user has visited following an authentication of the user;

providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server having a site visited by the user following the authentication that, when called by a browser of the user, causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the user's browser by sending cookie setting information to the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies,

wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser from a corresponding one of the affiliated servers.

Thus, according to this aspect of Applicant's invention, each affiliated server hosts an expire cookies page. A link to the expire cookies page is provided for each affiliated server having a site visited by the user following authentication. When the link is called by the user's browser, each affiliated server clears the cookies on the user's browser by sending cookie setting information to the user's browser. The cookie setting information causes the browser to expire the cookies by changing the settings of the cookies.

[0027] Page 4 of the Office Action indicates that this aspect of Applicant's invention is disclosed by Bladow at col. 17, lines 42-49. However, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, this portion of Bladow merely discloses that when a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server. The Web server then connects to the cookiejar server and requests logoff for the session. The cookiejar server identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie. After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar server sends a logoff status to the Web server, which returns the status to the client platform.

[0028] Thus, Bladow fails to disclose providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server having a site visited by the user following the authentication that, when called by a user's browser, causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the user's browser by sending cookie setting information to the user's browser, as recited in Applicant's claim 10. Instead, Bladow discloses that when a customer wants to logoff, the web server connects to the cookiejar server and requests logoff for the session.

[0029] Consequently, Bladow does not disclose all of the elements and features Applicant's claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

[0030] Independent claims 11, 15 and 24 include limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 10, and are allowable under a similar rationale.

Independent Claims 18 and 31

[0031] Applicant submits that Bladow does not anticipate claim 18 because Bladow does not disclose at least the following elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

...requesting a logout page from an authentication server by selecting a logout link, wherein the logout link is on any site on the affiliated domain servers that a user of the browser has visited following an authentication of the user or on the authentication server;

receiving image tags from the authentication server with the logout page;

issuing get image requests to URLs identified by the image tags;

clearing cookies identified by responses to the get image requests, wherein the clearing is carried out by changing settings of the cookies in accordance with **cookie setting information received from the affiliated domain servers hosting the URLs identified by the image tags;** and

rendering images received with the cookie setting information in responses from the affiliated domain servers for inclusion in a logout page displayed by the browser, wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser from the authentication server.

Thus, according to this aspect of Applicant's invention, image tags are received from the authentication server with the logout page. Image requests are issued to URLs identified by the image tags. Cookie setting information is received from

the affiliated domain server hosting the URLs identified by the image tags for clearing cookies. The images received with the cookie setting information are rendered for inclusion in the logout page.

[0032] Page 5 of the Office Action indicates that this aspect of Applicant's invention is disclosed by Bladow at col. 17, lines 42-49. However, as discussed above, this portion of Bladow merely discloses that when a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the web server, and the web server then connects to the cookiejar server and requests logoff for the session.

[0033] Thus, Bladow fails to disclose receiving image tags from the authentication server with the logout page; issuing get image requests to URLs identified by the image tags; or clearing cookies identified by responses to the get image requests, as recited in Applicant's claim 18. Bladow further fails to disclose rendering images received with the cookie setting information in responses from the affiliated domain servers for inclusion in a logout page displayed by the browser, as also recited in Applicant's claim 18.

[0034] Consequently, Bladow does not disclose all of the elements and features Applicant's claim 18. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

[0035] Independent claim 31 includes limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 18, and is allowable under a similar rationale.

New Independent Claim 42

[0036] Applicant submits that Bladow does not anticipate new claim 42 because Bladow does not disclose at least the following elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

...authenticating a user to visit sites on the affiliated servers by an authentication server associated with the affiliated servers;

providing a first cookie to a browser being used by the user, the first cookie for maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following the authentication of the user, wherein as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following the authentication, second cookies containing data associated with the corresponding affiliated servers are stored by the browser;

selecting, by the user, a single logout link, wherein the logout link is contained on any site that the user has visited on the affiliated servers or the authentication server following the authentication;

rendering a logout page on the browser of the user, said logout page causing the browser to generate a plurality of image requests based on the list of affiliated servers maintained by the first cookie, each image request corresponding to one of the affiliated servers listed in the list of affiliated servers;

receiving the image requests at URLs hosted by corresponding affiliated servers that causes the affiliated server receiving the image request to send an image and cookie setting information to the browser, wherein the cookie setting information is used for changing settings of the second cookies to

cause the second cookies to be expired by the browser, wherein expiration of the second cookies causes the user to be logged out of the affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following the authentication.

[0037] Thus, according to this aspect of Applicant's invention, a first cookie is used to maintain a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following authentication. When a logout link is selected, a logout page is rendered on the user's browser that causes the browser to generate a plurality of image requests based on the list maintained with the first cookie. The request causes the affiliated servers to send back cookie setting information and an image indicative of successful logout. The cookie setting information causes the browser to change settings of the second cookies for clearing the second cookies from the browser.

[0038] For the reasons discussed above, including those set forth with respect to claims 1 and 10, Applicant respectfully submits that Bladow does not disclose all of the elements and features Applicant's claim 42. Accordingly, Applicant believes this claim to be allowable as well.

Dependent Claims

[0039] In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Conclusion

[0040] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action**. Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

/Colin D. Barnitz/ Dated: 7/21/2008

Colin D. Barnitz (colin@leehayes.com; 512-505-8167)

Registration No. 35061

Emmanuel Rivera (emmanuel@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162)

Registration No. 45760

Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: 512-505-8167

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

www.leehayes.com